

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE Q80338 04/02/2004 Masahiro Ohmori 10/815,832 **EXAMINER** . 01/11/2005 23373 7590 BOS, STEVEN J SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT SUITE 800 1754 WASHINGTON, DC 20037

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
<b></b>	10/815,832	OHMORI ET AL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven Bos	1754
The MAILING DATE of this commun eriod for Reply	ication appears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comr  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum st  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a munication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of th tatutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO y will, by statute, cause the application to become A	a reply be timely filed  nirty (30) days will be considered timely.  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
tatus		
1) Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>02 <i>April</i> 2004</u> .	
	2b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practi	•	-
sposition of Claims		
4) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-5,7 and 17-20</u> is/are pen 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a 5) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,7 and 18-20</u> is/are allow 6) ⊠ Claim(s) <u>5 and 17</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restrict	are withdrawn from consideration. wed.	
oplication Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are Applicant may not request that any objected to a specific spec	: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to ection to the drawing(s) be held in abeya g the correction is required if the drawing	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies</li></ul>	documents have been received. documents have been received in a of the priority documents have been onal Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage
tachment(s)		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-2-2004</u> .		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 
Patent and Trademark Office DL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 01072005

Application/Control Number: 10/815,832

Art Unit: 1754

The amendment filed April 2, 2004 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: on pp. 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of the instant specification, each recitation of "titanium salt" is new matter.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Application/Control Number: 10/815,832

Art Unit: 1754

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 5, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graham '503.

Graham teaches a barium titanate, ie. BaTiO3, sol but differs as to the instantly claimed process of making same. See cols.1-2 and the examples.

Any difference imparted by the product by process limitations would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made because where the examiner has found a substantially similar product as in the applied prior art the burden of proof is shifted to the applicant to establish that their product is patentably distinct not the examiner to show the same process of making, In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685, In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324, In re Spada, 15 USPQ2d 1655, In re Fitzgerald, 205 USPQ 594, and MPEP 2113.

Claims 2-4,7,18-20 appear allowable over the cited prior art of record none of which teaches or suggests the instantly claimed combination of process steps nor the instantly claimed product characteristics.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Bos whose telephone number is 571-272-1350.

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1754

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8AM-6PM but is on increased flexitime sch.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Λ

Steven/ Bos

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1754

sjb